

ATTACHMENT A

PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT

REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES

2012 – 2017

June 10, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PURPOSE AND AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT PRIORITY, EXPECTED OUTCOMES, AND KEY TASKS FOR THE RELS	2
IV. SCOPE OF WORK/REQUIREMENTS	6
TASK 1: ONGOING ASSESSMENT OF REGIONAL NEEDS AND SERVICES	6
TASK 2: IDENTIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RESEARCH ALLIANCES	7
TASK 3: ANALYTIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	8
TASK 4: APPLIED RESEARCH AND EVALUATION STUDIES	9
TASK 5: DISSEMINATION	14
TASK 6: COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION	15
TASK 7: MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING	17
7.1: <i>Governing Board</i>	17
7.2: <i>Updated Annual Plan</i>	18
7.3: <i>Internal Quality Control System</i>	20
7.4: <i>Meetings with ED</i>	20
7.5: <i>Monthly Reporting</i>	21
7.7: <i>Evaluation</i>	23
TASK 8: COORDINATING ENTITY	23
V. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES/MILESTONES	25

I. Purpose and Authorizing Legislation

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) intends to enter into 5-year contracts with qualified entities to establish a networked system of ten Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs).¹ The current authorization for the Regional Educational Laboratories program is under the Education Sciences Reform Act (ESRA) of 2002, Part D, Section 174, (20 U.S.C. 9564), administered by the Institute of Education Sciences' (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) (see <[*Authorizing Legislation*](#)>).

This contract award is for one of the ten RELs. Each REL will carry out a range of activities to serve the needs of a specific region in the United States in accordance with the provisions stated in ESRA. These activities will include applied research, development, evaluation, dissemination, training and technical assistance activities that focus on using data and analysis to inform education decisions.

ED will make a separate award for each REL region. The current regional configuration for the RELs is indicated in the table below.

Regional Educational Laboratory	States included in Region
<i>Appalachia</i>	Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia
<i>Central</i>	Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming
<i>Mid-Atlantic</i>	Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, DC
<i>Midwest</i>	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin
<i>Northeast and Islands</i>	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, the Virgin Islands
<i>Northwest</i>	Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington
<i>Pacific</i>	American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap), Guam, Hawaii, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Palau
<i>Southeast</i>	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina
<i>Southwest</i>	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
<i>West</i>	Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah

As specified in ESRA, the amount of assistance allocated to each REL contractor shall reflect the number of local educational agencies, the number of school-age children

¹ Eligible applicants include research organizations, institutions of higher education, or partnerships among such entities, or individuals, with the demonstrated ability or capacity to carry out the activities authorized under the statute and in the contract.

within the laboratory region served, as well as the cost of providing services within the geographic area encompassed by the region.

II. Background

The REL program was established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Goals set for the RELs have changed throughout its history. Before 1985, ED asked that the laboratories pursue the broad goal of general educational improvement. Beginning with the 1985 competition, ED sought to enhance the impact of laboratories in their regions by identifying school and classroom improvement as the two main priority areas. In the 1990-1995 laboratory competition, the education of at-risk children became the focus area. For the 1995-2000 contracts, two priority areas were set: (1) promote excellence and equity for all students and (2) scale up reform to encompass all schools, all levels of educational administration, all programmatic areas, and diverse social contexts. In 2000-2005, laboratories were asked to (1) create procedural knowledge of the best practices for transforming low-performing schools into high-performing learning communities, and (2) promote use of such knowledge. In the latest contract period, 2006-2011, RELs became “emissaries of science,” providing policymakers and practitioners with training and technical assistance to inform effective decision-making. The technical assistance provided was to be based on the highest-quality evidence, as defined by scientifically valid research principles. RELs were also expected to engage in high quality, rigorous research to address the effectiveness of programs, policies, and/or practices intended to improve educational outcomes.

III. Overview of Current Priority, Expected Outcomes, and Key Tasks for the RELs

The priorities for the 2011-2016 REL competition are based on outreach conducted by ED and responses to an invitation from the IES Director to the educator community to comment on the future of the RELs. From these efforts, IES learned that, first, in the face of ongoing state and local budget constraints, research evidence will be an increasingly important factor in educational decision making. Second, existing federal investments in state and local data systems are yielding a valuable but largely untapped information resource. Third, state and local agencies want help in accessing and using these and other data to address their needs. Fourth, focusing the RELs’ development of knowledge and educator capacity on a small set of core topic areas should result in high quality work products and a deeper knowledge base on core issues, and facilitate a strong match between REL staff qualifications and their activities.

Key Priorities

The national priority of the regional educational laboratories is to help states and districts systematically use data and analysis to answer important issues of policy and practice with the goal of improving student outcomes. To the extent possible, the activities of each regional educational laboratory should address issues of importance within the region that also are of national concern. Issues of highest national concern are the following: early childhood education; identifying and retaining effective teachers and principals; adopting

and implementing rigorous academic standards and assessments; increasing college readiness, access, and completion; and improving low-achieving schools.

Each REL will build research capacity and a knowledge base in states and districts by:

- (1) assisting states, districts, and schools in using their data systems;
- (2) conducting and supporting high quality research and evaluation that focuses on a few key topics related to regional and national needs expressed in the region; and
- (3) helping education policy makers and practitioners to incorporate data-based inquiry practices into regular decision-making.

The RELs shall carry out these priorities primarily by working with new or existing partnerships of practitioners, policy makers or others. These partnerships are referred to in this work statement as “research alliances.” A *research alliance* is defined as a group of stakeholders who share a specific education concern and agree to work together to learn more about the concern so that they can make sound decisions to improve education outcomes.² The structure, size, and focus of each alliance will reflect the needs of the region and the ability of the REL to provide appropriate, high-quality services to them.

Research alliances are intended to maximize the number of states and districts within the region each REL can serve by linking together entities with similar data and/or research and evaluation needs. Alliances will allow the RELs to bring together Local Education Agencies (LEAs), State Education Agencies (SEAs), and others with similar education concerns in order to identify and provide appropriate technical assistance, conduct and support research and evaluation analyses, and disseminate useful and accessible products based on the research. Alliances will enable members to learn from each other as well as from REL staff and to develop ongoing collaborative structures or contacts that can persist without ongoing REL support.

RELs are encouraged to form regional, cross-state, or cross-district research alliances where appropriate, and/or to partner **with existing alliances**. In order to ensure equitable service within a region, RELs shall ensure that each state is represented in at least one large-scale alliance. As appropriate, RELs should seek to involve relevant state agencies in alliances.

During the 5-year contract period, alliances will either (a) end because goals were met, (b) expand in scope or membership to achieve broader goals, or (c) continue without REL presence because capacity among members to use data and analysis had been built.

² Members of the alliances are recipients of REL services and cannot be paid to participate. If an alliance participant has particular expertise required to complete an IES-approved work product, they can be compensated as a subcontractor or consultant but such arrangements must be approved by the COR and the ED’s contracts office.

Expected Program Outcomes

The priority for the REL program and the mechanism for delivering REL services are intended to yield several important benefits for the regions and for the nation. These include:

- Development of a cohesive and potentially deep body of knowledge in core, priority topics that address regional and, often, national needs;
- Increased use of evaluation, data, and analysis by educators and education policymakers to identify problems, choose programs and strategies, and learn from initiatives;
- Completion of a range of rigorous evaluation and research studies, methodologically appropriate to the questions the studies attempt to answer;
- Expansion of state and local capacity to use their own data, conduct high quality research and evaluation, and appropriately incorporate findings into policy and practice;
- Distribution of REL work across the region with a transparent and equitable process for determining where REL assistance is applied; and
- Establishment of strong partnerships among practitioners, policy makers, and researchers that are not dependent on ongoing REL support.

Key Tasks

To meet the requirements of the legislation and the national priority for this contract, and to achieve the objectives of the REL Program, the contractor shall perform the following essential tasks:

1. *Assess regional needs* through information collection and review of state and local research, evaluation, and data analysis needs. The assessment shall be ongoing, systematic, and transparent and include strategies for soliciting wide public input. The needs assessment shall be used in combination with the results of needs assessments from the other regional educational laboratories and, to the extent possible, the issues of greatest national concern outlined above to identify a small set of priority topic areas for the REL's work and the number, scope, duration, and specific focus of research alliances over the contract period. The process for conducting the assessments and the final determination of annual priorities shall be approved by the REL's governing board. More specific and direct needs will be assessed and determined through the research alliances, which may include governing board members.
2. *Maintain and refine research alliances* through meetings, communications, and assessment of alliance activities. The contractor shall have identified a prospective set of research alliances at the time of contract award. The proposed alliances may already be in existence, or the contractor may propose to develop new alliances. For new alliances, relevant LEAs, SEAs, and others as appropriate will need to be invited to join. The particular agenda of analytic technical support for each alliance will be modified and updated over time in accordance with

stakeholder needs. The LEAs and SEAs in the alliances will be the major clients of the REL as they work collaboratively with the contractor to refine research concerns and develop relevant data and analysis projects to inform those concerns. The contractor shall assess and document the progress, challenges, and lessons learned in each alliance in order to improve alliance activities.

3. *Provide analytic technical support*, delivered primarily through the research alliances, to help LEAs, SEAs, and others as appropriate more effectively incorporate data analysis and its results into their decision making. Analytic technical support under this task may include training and technical assistance on understanding available data systems, research and data analysis methods, and using data and research results to identify and solve problems in states, districts, and schools to build LEA and SEA capacity.. Materials developed for this analytic technical support task shall adhere to IES standards and follow IES review procedures.
4. *Conduct applied research and evaluation studies*. REL studies shall be designed to model for LEAs and SEAs how to define clear and researchable questions, select appropriate data and methods of analysis and examine and report research and evaluation evidence in clear and accessible ways. In designing and implementing these studies, the REL shall incorporate appropriate and scientifically-based methods and prepare reports in accordance with IES standards.
5. *Disseminate technical support products and study findings* broadly and using best practices on how to help stakeholders understand and use these materials. Products of Task 3 (e.g., “how to guides,” data reports or training materials) and of Task 4 (research and evaluation reports) shall be presented in an accessible way and convey information that is timely and meaningful to the relevant audiences. The contractors may rigorously evaluate dissemination strategies as part of Task 4, so that activities under Task 5 and the body of evidence on effective dissemination practices improves and expands.
6. *Collaborate and coordinate with other RELs* to promote efficiency in meeting regional needs, address national concerns as appropriate, prevent unnecessary duplication of activities, and ensure sharing and best use of available resources across regions. Collaboration includes working with other RELs and IES to ensure strategic deployment of resources across high priority areas. Collaboration also includes connecting stakeholders to other technical assistance providers funded by ED, such as the Comprehensive Centers, for needs that are outside the scope of the REL work
7. *Management and Reporting*. The contractor shall manage the schedule and costs, and maximize the quality of activities performed. The contractor shall submit management reports on their specified timetable. An Updated Annual Plan that includes a description of activities undertaken during the current year and plans for work to be conducted under each task during the succeeding year of the contract shall be submitted. Progress and financial reports will also be prepared

and submitted under this task. The contractor shall establish a governing board and hold periodic meetings of the board to oversee the work of the REL including its management and reporting.

8. *Coordinating entity.* One among the 10 contractors will be selected to organize collaboration and coordination among the 10 REL contractors by facilitating meetings/workshops, gathering and reporting on types of requests and products, and keeping the content of the REL intranet current and up to date.

Period of Performance

The period of performance is 60 months.

IV. Scope of Work/Requirements

The regional educational laboratory contractor shall implement a 5-year plan to build data use and research capacity within states and districts, according to the tasks described below. Although the tasks are identified and described separately, they shall be addressed in a coherent, unified fashion, as actions from one task will inform and support other tasks.

Task 1: Ongoing Assessment of Regional Needs and Services

With guidance from the governing board members, the contractor shall design and implement a systematic, transparent, and cost-effective process for identifying the analytic needs of the region during the contract period. This process shall include a well-defined means for soliciting the views of administrators at the state and local levels, as well as teachers, parents, and others in the education community. The contractor shall use this information to refine or modify the 3-5 topics of high priority in the region chosen as a focus for the REL's work and to identify, establish or refine research alliances. The contractor shall use information from the needs identification process to update the work agendas of the REL.

The contractor shall design and implement a system in which LEAs, SEAs, and others as appropriate are invited to request data and analysis support from the contractor. This public system should clearly articulate the role of the REL, how the REL makes decisions about which educational questions or data and analysis issues it pursues, which research alliances are currently active and accepting members or which new research alliances are being considered. Requests that do not fall within the scope of REL work shall be directed to other federal technical assistance providers as called for under Task 6 (Collaboration). The contractor shall submit to the coordinating entity (see Task 8) the description of the public request process so that it can be posted on the REL website; on a quarterly basis the contractor shall provide updated information for the REL website on the types of requests submitted.

As part of the ongoing needs assessment, the contractor shall also conduct an analysis of the numbers and types of clients served by the REL. This analysis of REL service coverage shall help the contractor target and make use of the needs assessment activities by identifying where the REL is already providing significant services and where it is not. The reports shall include the states or districts covered by the membership of the research alliances, taking into account some measures of the types and intensity of participation. The contractor shall provide the reports to the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) on a quarterly basis and, once approved, submit them to the coordinating organization for posting to the REL website.

Within one month after contract start date, the contractor shall submit a revised description of the needs assessment process to the COR for review. This document shall include a description of the public request system and procedures for calculating and posting REL service information. The COR will provide comments on the description within approximately 2 weeks of receipt. The contractor shall revise the description based on the COR's comments and then begin posting and updating the information on the website.

The contractor shall report its assessment of analytic needs identified under Task 1 and how those needs affect changes in priority topic areas or research alliances to the COR annually starting at 10 months from contract start date.

Deliverables:

- Description of analytic needs assessment process, including stakeholder request system and procedures for calculating and posting summary service information (draft and final)
- Initial and quarterly report on communities served by the contractor
- Annual assessment of analytic needs and influence on priority topic areas and research alliances

Task 2: Identification and Maintenance of Research Alliances

The primary mechanism for carrying out the core analytic work of the RELs (Tasks 3 and 4) shall be the research alliances. These research alliances may include LEAs, SEAs and others with similar education concerns. At least 85 percent of the resources spent on Tasks 3 and 4 shall be associated with work conducted for specific research alliances. For new research alliances defined at contract award, the contractor shall invite prospective members who have not already agreed to participate and through meetings³, conference calls, and other communications, establish and continue each partnership structure as needed. The activities to refine and maintain the alliances will serve to solidify the agenda of analytic work and specific activities that will be implemented by the REL on behalf of each alliance and provide an opportunity for practitioners and

³ REL funding cannot be used for invitational travel; therefore the contractor shall not provide federal reimbursement for travel or meal payments to recipients of REL services. Alliance members will need to pay for their participation in meetings.

policy makers to give input, and feedback to researchers at all stages of the analytic work including design, implementation, and dissemination of findings. On an annual basis, the contractor shall report on the progress of the REL's work with each research alliance, as well as the challenges and lessons learned across the alliances and how those lessons will affect future alliance activity.

The contractor shall identify and maintain as many alliances that are needed to adequately address the high priority topic areas in each state in the region. The contractor shall determine and justify the number, size, and scope of alliances needed to offer breadth and depth of knowledge to the priority areas. ED encourages the contractor to consider developing alliances that address the priority topic areas at multiple levels of governance (e.g., state, district, and school). The research alliances should maintain a consistent core of members to ensure continuity and progress with the research agenda. The contractor shall propose the number of members needed to be considered a "core" for each research alliance, as the appropriate number will be different depending on the scope and focus of each research alliance.

While the majority of research alliances are anticipated to operate within an individual region only, after award RELs may jointly sponsor research alliances that span two or more regions. For such cross-region research alliances, each REL participating in the research alliance shall clearly specify the research alliance activities it intends to conduct, products it intends to author, and a plan for sharing costs.

ED anticipates that the number, scope, and focus of research alliances might change in response to needs assessment conducted under Task 1 and work undertaken under Tasks 3 and 4. Before making any significant changes to the research alliance plan (such as starting a new research alliance) in place at the time of contract award, the contractor shall submit a proposal to the COR justifying the need and documenting the intended refinements in structure, scope, and focus for each alliance, including a detailed work agenda as well as any budget impacts. The proposal shall include letters of support from existing and/or prospective alliance members. The COR will respond to each proposal within approximately 2 weeks of submission. All proposed refinements shall be reflected in the updated annual plan (see Task 7).

Deliverables:

- Annual progress report on each research alliance (to be included in progress assessment document, see Task 7)
- Assessment of challenges and lessons learned in working with research alliances (to be included in progress assessment document, see Task 7)
- Proposal for refinement of/changes to research alliance plan

Task 3: Analytic Technical Support

The primary goal for this contract is to build capacity among education stakeholders to use data and analysis as a more routine part of their responsibilities. Building capacity means strengthening their knowledge, abilities, skills and behavior and potentially

improving their institutional structures and procedures such that educators – both policy officials and practitioners – can more ably make decisions based on research and evaluation evidence.

To support this goal, contractors shall give special emphasis to analytic training and technical assistance related to the use of state and district longitudinal data systems as a way to address the research alliances’ research questions. This analytic technical support may include workshops and other events, or the preparation of products for use by the alliances or beyond (such as indicator lists, data reports, “how-to” guides, spreadsheets that produce summary statistics from district or state data). Any product produced with REL support shall be reviewed by IES according to its scientific standards and made publicly available.⁴

The contractor shall consult and coordinate with other RELs in the network to determine whether similar analytic technical support activities are being conducted in other regions. The contractor shall identify issues or needs that overlap regions and make recommendations to IES for joint products or other collaborative activities (see Task 6). The contractor shall submit draft training materials, workshop programs, guidance documents, and other analytic technical support products to the COR 8 weeks in advance of their intended use with or distribution to research alliances. As needed, the COR will submit the products for external peer review, in keeping with the statutory mandate to ensure that REL products meet IES’ scientific standards. The contractor shall expect to respond to 2 rounds of comments and revision before the technical support products can be used or disseminated.

The contractor shall develop and implement a process for assessing customer satisfaction with the analytic training and technical assistance provided by the REL. Through the coordinating entity established in Task 8, IES intends to develop and seek clearance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for a customer satisfaction instrument that the RELs may use with research alliance participants. Within 4 weeks after using a technical support product with research alliances, the contractor shall submit a memo with the satisfaction assessment to the COR.

Deliverables:

- Analytic technical support products (draft and final)
- Reports assessing customer satisfaction with technical support activity

Task 4: Applied Research and Evaluation Studies

The contractor shall plan and implement research and evaluation projects using the most rigorous and appropriate method of inquiry to respond effectively to research questions identified with or by the research alliances. The questions selected should be well defined and clearly pertinent to high-priority needs identified by the research alliances’ needs

⁴ If the product contains school-level information, the contractor shall create a derivative public product that does not identify individual schools.

assessment, and the data collection and analysis shall meet IES standards. The contractor shall develop research and evaluation projects that use emerging state or local longitudinal data systems.

Types of Studies

The contractor is encouraged to work with LEAs, SEAs, and others as appropriate to identify, develop, and implement evaluations of new programs and policies. Such impact or effectiveness evaluations may be done in an opportunistic and cost effective manner by collaborating with alliance members to design experimental studies as opportunities arise. Evaluations that employ other methodologies to address questions of effectiveness must justify the approach and identify limitations. Relying on existing data or conducting small-scale supplemental data collection can minimize evaluation costs.

As requested by the research alliances, the contractor shall conduct short-term, descriptive research studies that investigate key policy or education practice concerns using appropriate and scientifically valid methods. Examples of such studies include tracking the progress of key groups of districts or schools, identifying or predicting students who may drop out or fail to apply to college, or cataloging and summarizing the policies relating to teacher recruitment, evaluation or compensation.

If identified as a need by a research alliance, the contractor shall prepare systematic evidence reviews of the effectiveness of strategies or programs of interest. As a first step, the contractor shall determine whether IES' What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>) already has prepared a relevant systematic review or has one underway. If no systematic review is underway or currently available from WWC, the contractor shall propose to conduct the evidence review, following the procedures, and standards used by the WWC, including the use of WWC-certified study reviewers.

Within 9 months of contract award, the prime contractor shall have at least 2 employees on staff who are certified by the WWC for conducting systematic reviews of studies and shall provide documentation to the COR of the background (credentials, experience, areas of expertise) and certification of reviewers available for systematic reviews. If the prime contractor does not have the required number of staff trained in WWC reviews, it shall plan to send candidates to a training session to be offered within the first 9 months of the contract.

A systematic review produced by a REL will be reviewed by IES but will not necessarily become a part of the What Works Clearinghouse.

The contractor shall consult and coordinate with other RELs in the network to determine if similar applied research or evaluation studies are being conducted in other regions. The contractor shall identify issues that overlap regions and propose joint analytic products or other collaborative activities to the COR (see Task 6).

For each planned research or evaluation project or systematic evidence review, the contractor shall submit a proposal to the COR detailing how the activity contributes to a research alliance agenda, the specific research questions, data to be used, broad plans for

analysis, and expected timelines for key steps. This proposal will be reviewed for adherence to IES standards by the COR and by a peer review team. For evidence reviews, the proposal shall include the draft topic area protocol intended to guide the search, screening, and coding of studies and the reviews may be conducted by the WWC contractor to ensure consistency with WWC procedures. The contractor shall assume that there will be 2 rounds of review and revision before the proposals are approved.

For studies employing statistical techniques, the contractor shall form an external technical working group (TWG) to advise the contractor on the design and conduct of the studies. Invited members of the TWG shall possess well documented methodological and/or substantive expertise relevant to the study. When possible, the contractor shall use the same TWG for groups of studies that are similar, as long as the TWG members have relevant experience for each.

The contractor shall submit to the COR a suggested list of TWG members and schedule of TWG meetings as part of the 2nd draft of the proposal for a research or evaluation study. The TWG list shall include proposed members, their affiliations, backgrounds and areas of expertise. The COR will provide comments in time for a final description of the TWG to be included in the final study proposal plan.

Three weeks before each scheduled TWG meeting, the contractor shall submit to the COR a draft agenda. The COR will review and provide comments within approximately 5 days. One week prior to the meeting, the contractor shall send meeting materials (e.g., draft PowerPoint slides, handouts) to the COR who will provide comments within approximately 3 days. The contractor shall submit a summary of the meeting within 1 week after it takes place. The contractor shall pay for the travel costs, per diem, and honorarium expenses for TWG members.

Other Approvals

If applicable, after a study proposal is approved the contractor shall seek approval for new data collection through the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Information Collection forms clearance process. In any case in which the contractor plans to collect data from more than 9 individuals, the contractor shall prepare a forms clearance package that lists the potential study participants, describes the study design and data collection instruments, and includes the necessary forms required for OMB approval. The contractor shall ensure that the clearance package justifies the necessity for collecting the data and comprehensively responds to each required item in the instructions.

The contractor shall submit the draft OMB clearance package to ED within eight weeks after ED has approved the study plan. ED will review and provide comments on the package within five weeks. The contractor shall submit the revised clearance package to ED within four weeks. ED will submit the package for review and transmission to OMB. The contractor shall be prepared to revise the forms and justification as required during the approval process, allowing for a minimum of 120 days during that process. ED will notify the contractor of the status of OMB approval.

The contractor is responsible for ensuring that each study has the appropriate Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. The contractor shall submit documentation of IRB approval to ED no later than four weeks after ED has approved the study plan. The contractor shall not begin work with human subjects until ED notifies the contractor that all IRB requirements have been met. If any data that are collected would enable the identification of individuals, a Privacy Act System of Records Notice (SORN) and report to OMB/Congress are required and shall be prepared by the contractor. The contractor shall allow 120 days for the clearance process.

The contractor, and all sub-contractors, shall comply with the Department of Education's IT security policy requirements, specifically those set forth in the *Handbook for Information Assurance Security Policy (OCIO-01)*, and other applicable procedures and guidance. The contractor, and all sub-contractors, shall develop and implement management, operational and technical security controls to assure required levels of protection for information systems. The contractor and all sub-contractors, shall further comply with all applicable Federal IT security requirements including, but not limited to, the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-130 Appendix III, Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPD), and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) standards and guidance.

If the contractor plans to collect or store personally identifiable data about students or will develop a data system or infrastructure as part of any REL study, the contractor may be required to obtain successful Certification and Accreditation (C&A) or Security Authorization (SA) of the system (includes commercially owned and operated systems managed by the commercial vendor and its sub contractors, supporting Department programs, contracts, and projects); obtain a full Authority to Operate (ATO) before being granted operational status; conduct performance of annual self-assessments of security controls; annual Contingency Plan testing; perform periodic vulnerability scans; update all information system security documentation as changes occur; and other continuous monitoring activities, which may include, mapping, penetration and other intrusive scanning. Full and unfettered access for the Department's third party Managed Security Services Provider (MSSP) must be granted to access all computers and networks used for this system. Additionally, when there is a significant change to the system's security posture, the system (Federal and commercial - prime and sub contractors included) must have a new C&A or SA, with all required activities to obtain a new ATO, signed by the Authorizing Official (AO).

System security controls shall be designed and implemented consistent with NIST SP 800-53 Rev 3, 'Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations.' All NIST SP 800-53 controls must be tested / assessed no less than every 3 years, according to federal and Department policy. The risk impact level of the system will be determined via the completion of the Department's inventory form and shall meet the accurate depiction of security categorization as outlined in Federal Information Publishing Standards (FIPS) 199, 'Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems.'

System security documentation shall be developed to record and support the implementation of the security controls for the system. This documentation shall be maintained for the life of the system. The contractor, and all sub-contractors, shall review and update the system security documentation at least annually and after significant changes to the system, to ensure the relevance and accurate depiction of the implemented system controls and to reflect changes to the system and its environment of operation. Security documentation must be developed in accordance with the NIST 800 series and Department of Education policy and guidance.

The contractor, and all sub-contractors, shall allow Department employees (or Department designated third party contractors) access to the hosting facility to conduct C&A/SA activities to include control reviews in accordance with NIST SP 800-53, Rev. 3 and NIST SP 800-53A. The contractor, and all sub-contractors, shall be available for interviews and demonstrations of security control compliance to support the C&A/SA process and continuous monitoring of system security. In addition, if the system is rated as 'Moderate' or 'High' for FIPS 199 risk impact, vulnerability scanning and penetration testing shall be performed on the hosting facility and application as part of the C&A/SA process. Appropriate access agreements will be reviewed and signed before any scanning or testing occurs.

Identified deficiencies between required NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 3 controls and the contractor's, and all sub-contractor's implementation, as documented in the Risk Assessment Report, System Security Plan (SSP) and Security Assessment Report (SAR), shall be tracked for mitigation through the development of a Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M) in accordance with the 'Handbook for Information Assurance Security Policy.' Depending on the severity of the deficiencies, the Department may require remediation before an ATO is issued.

If any IT contracts are awarded they shall ensure that:

1. Their IT product/system is monitored during all hours of operations using entrusted detective/preventive systems;
2. Their IT product/system has current antiviral products installed and operational;
3. Their IT product/system is scanned on a reoccurring basis;
4. Vulnerabilities are remediated in a timely manner on their IT product/system; and
5. Access/view for cybersecurity situational awareness on their IT product/system is made available to the Department CIRC (cyber incident response capability).

Data Collection and Analysis

Once OMB and IRB approval is obtained, the contractor shall implement the approved plan for collecting data for the project. While data collection is underway, the contractor shall submit to the COR a detailed plan for analyzing the data and reporting the study findings. The contractor shall assume 2 rounds of review and revision, lasting 6 weeks, to approve the detailed analysis and reporting plan.

In obtaining and using data, the contractor shall also comply with: Public Law 93-579, the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 USC 552a); the "Buckley Amendment," Family

Educational and Privacy Act of 1974, (20 USC 1232g); The Freedom of Information Act, (5 USC 522); and required regulations, including but not limited to: the Privacy Impact Assessment, 41 CFR Part 1-1 and 45 CFR Part 5b and, as appropriate, the Federal common rule or ED final regulations on the Protection of Human Subjects Participating in Research.

After the data have been collected and the analysis plan approved, the contractor shall prepare an analytic report. The contractor shall submit a first draft of the report to the COR; it will be reviewed by the COR and by a peer review team for adherence to IES standards. The contractor shall assume that there will be 2 rounds of review and revision before the report is approved for release and dissemination; this process may take up to 5 months. In the case of systematic evidence reviews, the contractor shall submit the approved protocol and study review guides along with the draft intervention or topic report to the COR, who will submit to the WWC contractor for their review. While the REL contractor shall publish the evidence review report as a REL product, the approved protocol, study review guides, and systematic review reports **may** become part of the WWC database.

For research or evaluation projects that ED determines to be major pieces of analysis on topics of national significance, the contractor shall prepare and submit restricted use data files and documentation to be housed at IES' National Center for Education Statistics. Such determination will be made at the outset of the project and in accordance with law. Any data that contributed to the analysis presented in those study reports (whether collected by the REL or not) must be available through restricted use file access. The intent of this requirement is to provide other researchers with an opportunity to replicate or extend the REL analysis. The contractor shall identify whether a study meets the restricted use file criteria when submitting proposals to the COR. IES/NCES guidelines for submitting restricted use file data and documentation can be found at: http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/2002/std7_1.asp.

Deliverables:

- Documentation of certification and background of evidence review coders
- Research/evaluation project proposals (3 drafts and final)
- Systematic evidence review project proposals (3 drafts and final)
- TWG member list, agenda, meeting materials, and meeting summary
- OMB Forms Clearance Package (draft and final)
- Documentation of IRB Approvals
- Preparation of Privacy Act System of Records Notice (if required)
- Analysis Plans (drafts and final)
- Research/evaluation analytic reports (drafts and final)
- Restricted use files and documentation (draft and final)

Task 5: Dissemination

The contractor shall ensure that the analytic technical support products and applied research and evaluation study findings are communicated in a way that is accessible,

timely, and meaningful to the day-to-day work of education practitioners and policy makers. Dissemination activities shall be related to identified regional needs and, as appropriate, to needs of national concern outlined above. The contractor shall utilize several avenues for communication, including organizing face to face meetings and webinars designed to facilitate awareness, understanding, and use of data and analysis results through a dialogue between researchers and education stakeholders, or what we call research-to-practice “bridge events”.⁵ These bridge events may be conducted for members of a specific research alliance or a broader set of participants as a way to share relevant information. For the purpose of the bridge events or other forms of dissemination, the contractor may prepare communication products tailored to specific stakeholders, such as one- to four-page briefs that highlight relevant details of a report or technical support product.

The contractor shall submit a plan for each proposed major dissemination activity, including the objectives, topic, resource materials, presenters, format, and budget, and/or a draft product to the COR for review at least 6 weeks in advance of the dissemination activity. Presentations by REL staff at research conferences, such as those sponsored by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) or the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness (SREE) are considered major dissemination activities. The COR will provide comments within 1 week and the contractor shall revise accordingly.

The contractor shall also develop and carry out a process for assessing the utility of and satisfaction with the dissemination activities and products implemented. Within 4 weeks after conducting a dissemination activity, the contractor shall submit a report to the COR that summarizes this assessment. On an annual basis, the contractor shall describe the lessons learned in disseminating REL products and information and how those lessons will affect any shifts in dissemination strategies in the subsequent year(s).

Deliverables:

- Plan for each dissemination activity (including bridge events and presentations) or product (draft and final)
- Reports with assessment of customer satisfaction with dissemination activity
- Assessment of challenges and lessons learned from dissemination activities (to be included in the progress assessment document, see Task 7)

Task 6: Collaboration and Coordination

In order to ensure the work of the RELs contributes to the development of a cohesive and potentially deep body of knowledge nationally as well as in each region, the contractor shall identify opportunities for collaboration and coordination with other REL contractors, other IES funded activities, and other federal technical assistance providers. In addition, the contractor shall seek out opportunities for collaboration and coordination

⁵ REL funding cannot be used for invitational travel; therefore the contractor shall not provide federal reimbursement for travel or meal payments to recipients of REL services. Participants in bridge events will need to pay for their own participation.

with other organizations that can add breadth and depth of expertise to particular research alliance activities.

Cross-REL Coordination

To coordinate across RELs, the contractor shall form cross-REL partnerships to work on issues of national importance where multiple regions have common needs under Tasks 2-5. The contractors shall share approved technical support products that are not published on REL websites (such as workshop agendas, technical assistance memos, working spreadsheets) through a REL intranet (supported by the coordinating organization) and other avenues as specified by ED. Relevant contractor staff shall participate in monthly calls (working groups) facilitated by the coordinating organization, organized around key topics defined by the 10 RELs and IES and designed to enhance coordination.

The contractor shall participate in up to 2 meetings per year, held at IES. One will be a meeting of REL directors and one will be a larger meeting (up to 5 staff in addition to the director), designed to bring together RELs working on similar data and analysis issues and to share lessons learned across organizations.

During the contract period, the contractor shall also host or co-host one workshop for appropriate staff of all other RELs and for the IES REL team. The workshop topics will be determined jointly with ED and the other RELs and will reflect the particular expertise or issues with which the host REL has experience. The contractor shall expect to send up to 3 staff, twice each year, to participate in workshops hosted by the other 9 REL contractors. In preparation for hosting one of these meetings, the contractor shall submit a proposed plan to the COR (topic, objectives, agenda, budget, strategy for assessing satisfaction) at least 2 months before the event. The COR will provide comments within 1 week and the contractor shall revise accordingly. Within 2 weeks of participating in each workshop hosted by another REL, the contractor shall submit a memo to the COR describing the strengths and weaknesses of the event and suggestions for improving that workshop and the workshop series in general. The IES REL team will summarize and distribute useful suggestions as a means of improving coordination and REL effectiveness.

Collaboration with Other Federal Technical Assistance Providers and Organizations

The contractor shall refer stakeholders that identify needs that are outside the scope of REL analytic support, or that can be more effectively met by others, to other available resources. Therefore, the contractor shall have a clear, thorough, and updated knowledge of the network of organizations that provide different forms of assistance to stakeholders. This network should include other ED resources (such as the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), comprehensive centers, National Center for Education Research (NCER) research centers), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) as well as other federal organizations that provide educational services to state and local education agencies. The contractor shall develop a strategy for helping stakeholders make effective connections with these other services and shall report referrals on a monthly basis through the REL intranet.

The contractor may collaborate or team with other organizations providing technical assistance in a manner consistent with the intent and scope of this work statement. In particular, the contractor shall stay abreast of the work of IES' National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) on the State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) project, which is currently assisting over 40 states in developing and implementing longitudinal student data systems designed to improve data-based decision-making and research (see <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/slids/>). These data systems supported by the SLDS grant program are intended to be the foundation of much of the analytic technical assistance and research and evaluation activities conducted by the RELs. The contractor shall not duplicate the information gathered or technical assistance provided by NCES relating to state data systems. The contractor shall send 1 staff person to an NCES-sponsored open meeting on SDLS each year.

Before committing to a collaborative activity (joint meeting, development of a common product), the contractor shall submit a proposed plan (topic, objectives, agenda, budget, strategy for assessing satisfaction) to the COR for review at least one month before the planned activity. The COR will provide comments within 1 week and the contractor shall revise accordingly and carryout the activity only with COR approval.

Deliverables

- Documentation of technical support materials
- Plan for REL hosted workshop (draft and final)
- Memos summarizing strengths and weaknesses of REL workshops
- Documentation of technical assistance referrals
- Plans for collaboration with other technical assistance providers (draft and final)

Task 7: Management and Reporting

The contractor shall effectively manage all tasks, with guidance from a statutorily required governing board and in reporting to the COR.

7.1: Governing Board

Within eight weeks from the start date of the contract, the contractor shall form a governing board to guide the REL activities in accordance with program legislation and the requirements of the contract. The contractor shall appoint the members to the board to reflect the states in the region, as well as the interests of regional constituencies and shall include members who have expertise in education research methods and practice, teachers, and individuals representing the interests of students in economically disadvantaged areas, both rural and urban. The contractor shall offer every Chief State School Officer in the laboratory's region the opportunity to serve on the board, or to designate a personal representative to serve.

The contractor shall ensure that the board members clearly understand their roles and that the by-laws provide for periodic rotation of board membership. The contractor shall ensure that no REL staff or its sponsoring institution shall serve as a voting board

member or officer. The contractor shall ensure that the governing board is given ample opportunity to provide guidance on how the laboratory shall carry out its activities; plan joint activities that include multiple regions; and create a strategic plan to reduce unnecessary and/or redundant activities, increase collaboration and resource sharing, and other activities as specified in Section 174(h) of ESRA.

The contractor shall ensure that the Board allocates the regional educational laboratory's resources to and within each State in a manner that reflects the need for assistance, taking into account such factors as the proportion of economically disadvantaged students, the increased cost burden of service delivery in areas of sparse populations, and any special initiatives being undertaken by State, intermediate, local education agencies, or Bureau-funded schools as appropriate, which may require special assistance from the laboratory.

The contractor shall submit to ED within 8 weeks of the start date of the contract award, a report on the establishment of the governing board, by-laws, a list of members, and analysis of how the board meets the representational requirements. The first board meeting shall be held within the first twelve weeks of award. Meeting agendas shall be created in consultation with the Board members at least 2 months before the Board meeting occurs. The meeting agenda shall reflect a commitment by the contractor to engage the Board members actively in the decision making of the REL. The agenda shall be submitted for approval by ED at least six weeks before the meetings. The contractor shall submit to ED minutes and actions within one month after each meeting. The contractor shall plan to convene governing board members up to 3 times each year of the contract, with up to 2 meetings a year in person. All in-person meetings must be held at locations within the region served.

Deliverables

- Report on formation and membership of board, including by-laws and representation analysis
- Draft meeting agendas at least six weeks before meetings
- Report on each Governing Board meeting, including minutes, actions, and outcomes

7.2: Updated Annual Plan

Three months before the end of each contract year the contractor shall update the activities for each task and propose a work plan, schedule and budget for the upcoming year in the Updated Annual Plan.

Two months before the end of the contract year the contractor shall provide the COR with a document that includes progress assessments of current year activities. The document shall address progress toward indicators of success identified at the start of contract (see subtask 7.6) and shall include a brief summary of the following:

- Assessment of regional analytic needs and influence on priority topic areas and research alliances (resulting from Task 1)
- Progress report on each alliance, including approved modifications to the number, structure, and focus (resulting from Task 2)

- Assessment of challenges and lessons learned in working with research alliances (resulting from Task 2)
- Progress on approved technical support and applied research and evaluation activities, including completion of milestones and challenges/problems encountered (resulting from Tasks 3 and 4)
- Assessment of challenges and lessons learned from dissemination activities (resulting from Task 5)
- Assessment of challenges and lessons learned from collaboration and coordination activities (resulting from Task 6)

The updated annual plan shall describe the proposed work for the upcoming year, and include a budget and schedule appropriate to carry out that work. The plan shall take into account the statutory requirement that the offeror allocate not less than 25 percent of its resources to meeting the needs of rural areas. Once approved, this information will be used to fix the amount and timetable for payment to the contractor for completion of contracted work during the year. The contractor shall submit two copies (and an electronic version in MS Word) to the COR and one to the CS. The COR and CS will review and provide initial comments on the updated annual plan within 4 weeks of submission. The contractor shall assume 2 rounds of revisions to the updated annual plan, to be completed within 1 month after the initial comments from ED.

To guide the work in year 1 of the contract, the contractor shall prepare a 12-month work plan with the proposed work, schedule, and budget for those activities at the time of contract award.

Deliverables

- Year 1 work plan
- Annual progress assessment document
- Updated annual plan including budget and payment schedule (drafts and final)

7.3: *Internal Quality Control System*

The contractor shall set up an efficient and effective system for ensuring that analytic technical support and applied research and evaluation products meet IES review standards and are of the highest quality. Meeting IES standards for published products requires providing a clear objective and rationale for the activity, using a methodology appropriate to the objective, and describing comprehensively the methodological approach including its limitations.

The contractor shall ensure that personnel with appropriate substantive and methodological expertise conduct careful reviews of plans and products before submission to the COR. IES will hold two workshops during the contract period, one within 12 weeks of contract award and one in year 3, to train these and other pertinent personnel on IES scientific standards and the review process. The contractor shall send up to 5 staff to each workshop. Annually on the anniversary of the contract award, the contractor shall prepare and submit a memo documenting areas of difficulty encountered in meeting IES product standards and strategies for addressing these difficulties.

Deliverables:

— Annual memo on difficulties meeting IES review standards

7.4: *Meetings with ED*

The contractor shall bring up to 5 key personnel to meet in Washington, DC with the Contracting Officer (CO), Contracting Specialist (CS) and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) within two weeks after contract award for the initial contract kick-off meeting. Within two weeks after the meeting, the contractor shall submit a summary of the meeting discussions, including any outstanding issues raised.

The contractor shall meet subsequently with ED as indicated in the subtasks, provide periodic reports and furnish information as needed to keep ED informed at all times of key accomplishments, progress in accomplishing tasks, major upcoming activities, actual or potential problem areas, and services and products completed. REL directors shall meet with the COR and other appropriate ED staff at least twice a month by conference call and up to twice each year in Washington, DC, over the duration of the contract.

The purpose of the bi-monthly conference calls is to brief ED on the progress being made on the tasks and to discuss issues as they arise. The contractor shall send the monthly report (subtask 7.5) at least 3 working days before each monthly call so that both the contractor and COR are aware of the main issues that need to be addressed in the call. Within 5 working days following each meeting, the contractor shall prepare a memo summarizing the key issues and concerns raised at the meeting and how each will be addressed. The contractor shall communicate with the COR before and after each meeting or conference call to discuss main points and follow-up as needed.

Deliverables:

- Memo summarizing discussions at contract kick-off meeting
- Memos summarizing key issues and actions discussed in monthly meetings/conference calls

7.5: Monthly Reporting

The contractor shall submit a monthly progress report, due within 10 workdays after the end of each month that includes the following sections:

- A *succinct* summary of the major activities under each task and accomplishments for the reporting period
- A summary of the budget and expenditures for the period and cumulatively, with a clear identification of the extent of budget devoted to and resources spent on activities in rural area.
- Unexpected challenges, delays, or other issues that need to be addressed. In this section the contractor shall specify the extent to which the work is on schedule and within budget, identify and discuss significant deviations and time factors in the plan, and identify and discuss any decisions which may be needed from ED. If there are exceptions to the management plan, the contractor shall describe the plan for resolving the problems.
- A description of major activities planned for the next month, including a schedule of deliverables

In addition, the contractor shall submit monthly public vouchers for fixed price deliverables committed to in each year's work plan. Once the COR reviews the deliverable and if it is acceptable, the COR will provide a recommendation of acceptance to the CO. The CO will inform the contractor that the deliverable has been accepted and that it can be included in an invoice. The contractor shall attach the deliverable to the voucher submitted to ED for payment.

Deliverables

- Monthly progress reports and public vouchers

7.6: Final Report

Preparation for the final report begins at the start of the contract. Within ten weeks of the start of the contract, the contractor shall schedule a phone call with the COR to discuss a set of indicators that it will use to measure its success in achieving the six program outcomes described in Section III of this Scope of Work. Within two weeks of the conference call, the contractor shall submit a memo with its proposed indicators of success. The memo also shall indicate the data sources that will be used for these indicators. The contractor shall expect one set of revisions to this memo. The indicators may be renegotiated annually with the COR, based on changes in the needs of the region.

Six months before the end of the period of performance, the contractor shall submit a draft final report that describes its key accomplishments and success in meeting the indicators that are established at the beginning of the contract period and updated as necessary; identifies lessons learned by REL staff about assisting educators and policymakers to use data and research evidence more effectively; and provides recommendations for future research that could benefit the region. ED will provide additional guidance on the specific format and content of the report. The final report is anticipated to be 30 pages in length.

ED will review the draft final report and provide comments within four weeks. The contractor shall incorporate ED comments for the final report. The contractor shall submit five copies (and an electronic version in MS Word) to ED and one to the CO. The final report shall be due on the last day of the contract period.

Deliverables

- Memo describing indicators of success (draft and final)
- Final report (draft and final)

7.7: Evaluation

ED may conduct an independent evaluation of each laboratory during the contract. The contractor shall plan to cooperate with ED requests for information and other types of assistance needed to conduct the evaluation.

Task 8: Coordinating Entity

ED will select one contractor to be the coordinating entity for all ten RELs. Within 3 months of contract award, the coordinating contractor shall solicit input from each REL contractor to form working groups on key topics in need of information sharing. The coordinating contractor shall submit a list of proposed working group topics and clear, measurable objectives for each working group to the COR within 4 months after award. The coordinating entity shall organize monthly or semi-annual phone conferences of each working group, as needed; participation in any work group conference or activity by personnel other than REL staff shall be approved by the COR of the coordinating contractor. The coordinating contractor shall document the schedule, accomplishments, and key issues discussed in each phone conference and submit a report to the COR each month. In consultation with the other RELS and based on identified needs, the contractor shall propose to the COR updates to the list of working groups and other opportunities for information sharing, as appropriate. The coordinating contractor shall also identify, with input from the working groups, opportunities for additional collaboration, for example collaboration across Tasks 3 and 4 or research syntheses.

The coordinating contractor shall have primary responsibility for developing a customer satisfaction instrument that can be used by all 10 REL contractors to collect information on their technical assistance and dissemination events and for assessing satisfaction with REL products. The coordinating contractor shall solicit input from the RELs and the COR on changes to any instruments. A draft instrument shall be submitted to the COR within 6 months of contract award. The contractor shall seek approval for data collection through the OMB Information Collection forms clearance process described above. The coordinating contractor shall submit a draft OMB package within 8 weeks after approval of the forms by the COR. The COR will provide comments on the package within approximately 2 weeks. The contractor shall submit a final version of the OMB package, including final survey instrument within 2 weeks.

A key avenue for cross-REL communication will be an intranet. Although the REL intranet will be hosted by IES, the coordinating contractor shall develop the design for it. Within 2 months of contract award, the contractor shall submit to the COR a draft plan including proposed objectives of the intranet and the wireframes expected to best meet these objectives. The COR and the information technology staff at IES will review; the contractor shall assume 2 rounds of comments and revision extending over a 2 month time period. Once the intranet design has been implemented by IES, the contractor shall package and submit to IES for posting all materials received from the RELs on a monthly basis, as described above.

The coordinating contractor shall document submission of technical support materials for the REL intranet and REL referrals to other technical assistance organizations, based on monthly data provided by each of the REL contractors. The contractor shall submit a tracking report on these activities for the prior month to the COR by the 10th day of the next month.

In addition, the contractor shall track and keep current lists of reports and other products from the REL work. Product tracking shall include keywords that enable easy identification of products according to region; SEA; LEA characteristics as appropriate; student characteristics such as English language learner, as appropriate; and topic, with special attention to national priority topics identified in Section III of this Performance Work Statement.

Deliverables

- Proposed list of working group topics (initial and updated as needed)
- Monthly report on working group conferences
- Draft and final customer satisfaction survey instrument
- Customer satisfaction survey OMB submission package for evaluating dissemination events
- Design for REL intranet (draft)
- Monthly tracking report on technical support materials submitted for the REL intranet and referrals to other technical assistance organizations

V. Schedule of Deliverables/Milestones

Deliverable	Due Date (Dates are listed from contract start date unless noted otherwise)
Task 1 – Ongoing Assessment of Regional Needs and Services	
Description of analytic needs assessment process on website	One month; Updated on quarterly basis (or more often, if needed)
Initial and quarterly report on communities served by the contractor	One week; then updated quarterly
Annual assessment of analytic needs	10 months; then annually
Task 2—Maintenance and Refinement of Research Alliances	
Annual progress report on each research alliance	10 months, then annually
Assessment of challenges and lessons learned in working with research alliances	10 months, then annually
Proposals for refinement of/changes to research alliance plans	As needed
Task 3—Analytical Technical Support for Stakeholders	
Analytic technical support products (draft and final)	Draft due at least 8 weeks before intended use; final must be approved before use.
Reports with assessment of customer satisfaction with technical support activity	Within 4 weeks after implementation or distribution of technical support
Task 4—Applied Research and Evaluation Studies	
Documentation of certification and background of evidence review coders	Within 4 months
Research/evaluation project proposals	As needed
Systematic evidence review project proposals	As needed
TWG member list	At time of 2 nd draft of research proposal
TWG draft agenda	Three weeks prior to TWG meeting
TWG meeting materials	One week prior to TWG meeting
Summary of TWG meeting	One week after TWG meeting
OMB Forms Clearance Package	8 weeks after study plan is approved
Documentation of IRB Approvals	4 weeks after study plan is approved
Preparation of Privacy Act System of Records Notice	As needed
Analysis plans	During Data collection phase
Research/evaluation analytic reports (drafts and	As agreed in approved research plan

final)	
Restricted use files and documentation	One month after first draft is submitted
Task 5 – Dissemination	
Plan for each dissemination activity or product	6 weeks before each activity
Reports with assessment of customer satisfaction with dissemination activity	4 weeks after each activity
Assessment of challenges and lessons learned from dissemination activities	10 months, and then annually
Task 6—Collaboration and Coordination	
Documentation of technical support materials	Monthly
Plan for REL hosted workshop (draft & final)	Draft due 2 months before workshop Final due at least 6 weeks before the workshop
Memos summarizing strengths and weaknesses of REL workshops	2 weeks after each event
Documentation of technical assistance referrals	Monthly
Plans for collaboration with other technical assistance providers (draft and final)	Draft due two months before planned activity Final due at least 6 weeks before planned activity
Task 7 – Management and Reporting	
Report on formation and membership of Governing Board	Within 8 weeks
Draft meeting agendas	6 weeks before meeting
Minutes, actions, outcomes of Board meetings	One month after each meeting
Year 1 work plan	Within 10 weeks of award
Annual progress assessment document	10 months; Annually
Updated Annual Plan, including budget and payment schedule	First draft due at 9 months, final due at 12 months
Memo on difficulties meeting IES standards	12 months; Annually
Memo summarizing discussions at contract kick-off meeting	2 weeks after meeting
Memos summarizing key issues and actions discussed in monthly meetings/conference calls	5 days after calls
Monthly progress reports and public vouchers	10 days after end of each month
Memo describing indicators of success (draft and final)	Draft due within 10 weeks of award, final at 12 weeks of award; updated annually as necessary
Final report (draft and final)	Draft due 6 months before contract end date, final due on last day of contract

Task 8 – Coordinating Entity (relevant to one REL only)	
Proposed list of working groups	4 months after contract award
Monthly report on working group phone conferences	10 th day of each month
Draft customer satisfaction survey	6 months after contract award
Customer satisfaction survey OMB submission package	Draft 8 weeks after approval from COR, final due 2 weeks after COR review
Design for REL intranet (draft)	Draft due at 2 months
Monthly tracking report on technical support materials submitted for the REL intranet and referrals to other technical assistance organizations	10 th day of each month